



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,888	08/15/2001	Takehiko Nakano	SONYJP 3.0-199	9309
530	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			BATURAY, ALICIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/929,888

Applicant(s)

NAKANO ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia Baturay

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2002.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/929,888.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 011005.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-11 are pending.

#### ***Specification***

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2, lines 18-19, Applicant states "...each time control devices *selects* a portion to be controlled." It is believed Applicant meant to use "select." Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the identification information" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear whether the applicant is referring to the identification information corresponding to the selected portion or to the control device.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croÿ et al. (U.S. 6,476,825) and further in view of Yanagawa (U.S. 6,667,992).
8. As to claim 1, Croÿ discloses a network including an information device connected to a control device via communication means having a prescribed communication format a method for controlling a plurality of portions in the information device (Croÿ, Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-34), comprising: providing selecting means to at least one of the plurality of control devices from the information device (Croÿ, col. 5, lines 39-44); selecting one of the portions

to be controlled using the selecting means; and transmitting information corresponding to the selected portion and identification information corresponding to the one control device to the information device (Croÿ, col. 17, lines 32-47). But Croÿ does not expressly disclose the use of multiple control devices or a correspondence table. However, Yanagawa does teach preserving the identification information corresponding to the selected portion and the identification information corresponding to the one control device as a control correspondence table, where the information corresponding to the selected portion and the identification information correspond with each other (Yanagawa, col. 17, lines 26-45); repeating the selecting step, the transmitting step and the preserving step each time control devices select a portion to be controlled (Yanagawa, col. 30, lines 43-50); issuing a control request from another of the plurality of control devices to control another of the portions to be controlled, where the control request includes identification information corresponding to the another control device; and controlling the another portion to be controlled by referring to the control corresponding table (Yanagawa, col. 24, lines 6-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Croÿ with Yanagawa in order to allow for devices to be controlled from different controllers (Yanagawa, col. 3, lines 45-48).

9. As to claim 2, the combination of Croÿ and Yanagawa (Croÿ-Yanagawa) discloses the invention substantially including where the information device is connected to the plurality of control devices via an IEEE 1394 digital interface (Croÿ, col. 4, lines 38-47).

10. As to claim 3, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1, including where the selecting step includes providing a pass-through command defined in an AV/C panel subunit model and command set from the information device to the one control device and the step of controlling the one portion to be controlled includes controlling using the pass-through command defined in the AV/C panel subunit model and the command set (Yanagawa, col. 21, lines 44-49).
11. As to claim 4, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1, including where the information device reproduces software information recorded in a digital versatile disc (Croÿ, col. 20, line 59 – col. 21, line 4).
12. As to claim 5, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1, including where the information device is connected to the plurality of control devices via an interface based on a wireless communication (Croÿ, col. 4, lines 32-34).
13. As to claim 6, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5, including where the wireless communication uses the Bluetooth method (Croÿ, col. 26, lines 37-42).
14. As to claim 7, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5, including where the wireless communication uses an infra-red ray method (Croÿ, col. 4, lines 32-34).

15. As to claim 8, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1, including where the information device reproduces audio visual information recorded on a hard disc (Croÿ, col. 20, line 59 – col. 21, line 4).
16. As to claim 9, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1, including where each of the plurality of control devices is a digital television receiver capable of receiving digital broadcasts (Croÿ, col. 21, lines 7-10).
17. As to claim 10, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses an information processing apparatus connected to a plurality of control devices via communication means having a prescribed communication format to form a network (Croÿ, Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-34), the information processing apparatus comprising: a plurality of portions to be controlled, each of the plurality of portions being controllable by any one of the plurality of control devices (Croÿ, col. 5, lines 39-44); a transmitter operable to provide selection means to each one of the plurality of control devices, for each control device, the selection means being operable to select one of the plurality of portions to be controlled by the control device (Croÿ, col. 17, lines 32-47); a receiver operable to receive information corresponding to the selection portion and identification information corresponding to the control devices having selected the selected portion; a preserving unit operable to preserve the information corresponding to the selected portion and the identification information as a control correspondence table, the information corresponding to the selected portion and the identification information corresponding with each other (Yanagawa, col. 17, lines 26-45); and a controller operable to control another of

the portions to be controlled upon issuance of a control request from another of the plurality of control devices referring to the control correspondence table to determine which control device corresponds to the identification information of the another control device (Yanagawa, col. 24, lines 6-16).

18. As to claim 11, Croÿ-Yanagawa discloses an information control system, comprising: an information device having a plurality of portions to be controlled; a plurality of control devices, each control device being capable of controlling each of the plurality of portions in the information device (Croÿ, Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-34) and having selection means for selecting one of the plurality of portions to be controlled (Croÿ, col. 5, lines 39-44) and control request means for issuing a request to control the selected portion, the information device and the plurality of control devices being connected via communication means having a prescribed communication format to form a network (Croÿ, Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 28-34); a transmitter operable to provide the selection means to each one of the plurality of control devices; a receiver operable to receive information corresponding to the selected portion and identification information corresponding to one of the plurality of control devices having selected the selected portion; a preserving unit operable to preserve the information corresponding to the selected portion to be controlled and the identification information corresponding to the one control device as a control correspondence table, where the information and the identification information correspond with each other (Yanagawa, col. 17, lines 26-45); and a controller for controlling each of the selected portions by referring to



Art Unit: 2155

the control correspondence table to determine which control device corresponds to the identification information (Yanagawa, col. 24, lines 6-16).

Art Unit: 2155

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER